

REMARKS

Claim 1 is pending in the present application. Claim 1 is herein amended to correct a mistranslation. The amendment is supported, for example, from the description at page 11, lines 21-27 in the specification. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office action mailed on November 1, 2007.

Information Disclosure Statement

To comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.97, Applicants have resubmitted the subject references (e.g., references listed on the information disclosure statement filed on March 15, 2007) in a separately filed information disclosure statement.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Benda et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,937,992) in view of *Narahara et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0042735).

Applicants disagree with the examiner's grounds for rejection and request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Applicants submit that neither reference discloses a system for managing a quantity of inventory of parts constituting a product comprising *a first and second inventory quantity computing means*. In the present invention, for example, the system includes a first inventory

quantity computing means for computing a *tentative quantity* of inventory of the parts at one of the stages AND a second inventory quantity computing means for computing *actual quantities* of inventory of the parts at the other stages. The claim language clearly distinguishes the two inventory quantity computing means. Whereas, neither reference discloses such a system comprising a first and second computing means.

Furthermore, Applicants believe, based on the examiner's remarks in the November 1, 2007 Office action, that the aforementioned claim features were not appreciated by the examiner. *See*, page 3 of Office action (the examiner ignored the modifying terms "tentative" and "actual" from the phrases "quantity of inventory".)

Accordingly, Applicants submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented. Thus, Applicants request that the examiner withdraw the obviousness rejection of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants point out that the combination of cited references does not disclose a system for managing a quantity of inventory of parts constituting an assembled product to be supplied to an assembly plant from a first parts manufacturer and a second parts manufacturer. *See* Fig. 1. Instead, for example, the *Benda et al* system is for optimizing a shipment of goods, the shipment being to a first receiver maintaining a first inventory of goods at a first receiver location and to a second receiver maintaining a second inventory of goods at a second receiver location, the shipment of goods being from a first shipper located at a first source location and from a second shipper located at a second source location. *See*, Col. 4, lines 10-19. The shipments are not to the same receiver or to the same location. Thus, Applicants

submit that the present invention would not be obvious in view of the combined teachings of the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Darrin A. Auito

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 56,024

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/mra